

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are amended, Claims 4 and 8 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new Claims 9-16 are added by the present amendment. Amended Claims 1-3 and 5-7 and new Claims 9-16 are supported by the original claims, and therefore add no new matter.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1, 3, 5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Son et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,278,887 hereinafter "Son"); Claims 4/1, 4/3, 8/5 and 8/7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Son; Claims 2, 6, 4/2 and 8/6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Son in view of Yoshinori (JP 9-252342).

Amended Claim 1 recites a communication terminal apparatus comprising, *inter alia*:

...  
a detector configured to detect completion of  
information reception by the receiving means from the  
network;  
display control means for causing the display to display  
the information received by the receiving means from the  
network, if the detector has detected the completion of the  
information reception; and  
an illumination controller configured to cause the  
illumination means to illuminate the display, if the detector has  
detected the completion of the information reception.

Son describes a portable telephone including a display 108 with a backlight. The backlight may be illuminated to enable a user to read the display more easily.<sup>1</sup> However, it is respectfully submitted that Son does not teach or suggest "a detector," "display control means," or "an illumination controller" as recited in Claim 1.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Son, column 4, lines 32-46.

On page 3, the outstanding Office Action cites column 5, line 52 to column 6, line 30 as teaching these elements. However, this portion of Son does not discuss the backlight at all. Son describes in this passage that *the display itself* may be turned on at the end of a phone call.<sup>2</sup> Further, Son describes that the display may be turned on at the end of a call to display *data about the call*, such as the call length.<sup>3</sup> Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in Son to display *information received from a network* on the display, as recited in Claim 1.

Further, Son describes turning on the display at the end of a *phone call*.<sup>4</sup> A phone call is a communication participated in by the user. Accordingly, the user knows when the call is completed. In contrast, a download of information from a network is not participated in or controlled by the user. Thus, the user does not know when the download will be completed. For this reason, the completion of a phone call and the completion of information from a network are very different. The lack of predictability of information reception from a network is not even mentioned by Son, much less addressed by the apparatus described by Son. Consequently, the “detector configured to detect completion of information reception by the receiving means from the network” recited in Claim 1 provides a significant advantage over the apparatus described by Son.

Accordingly, Son does not teach or suggest “a detector,” “display control means,” or an “illumination controller” as recited in Claim 1. Since Son does not teach or suggest each and every element of Claim 1, Claim 1 (and new Claim 9 dependent therefrom) is believed to be patentable over Son.

Amended Claims 3, 5, and 7 and new Claims 15 and 16 recite similar elements to Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 3, 5, 7, 15, and 16 (and new Claims 11, 12, and 14 dependent

---

<sup>2</sup>See Son, column 6, lines 20-21.

<sup>3</sup>See Son, column 6, lines 21-24.

<sup>4</sup>See Son, column 6, lines 20-21.

therefrom) are believed to be patentable over Son for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 2 and 6 as unpatentable over Son in view of Yoshinori, it is respectfully submitted that Yoshinori does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of Son. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2 and 6, which recite similar elements to Claim 1, (and new Claims 10 and 13 dependent therefrom) are patentable over Son in view of Yoshinori for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.


Accordingly, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Michael R. Casey, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 40,294